

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/432,334	11/02/1999	RONALD A. GUIDOTTI	98-2069 9910	
23413 75	590 02/26/2002		<i>:</i>	
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002		•	EXAMINER	
			MAPLES, JOHN S	
	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1745 DATE MAILED: 02/26/2002	/3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_	<u> </u>	45~13
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/432,334	GUIDOTTI ET AL.
Offic Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	John S. Maples	1745
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a in - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stated - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be t reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS frot tute, cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed ays will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	<u> 0 December 2001</u> .	
<u> </u>	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice und Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 21,24-28 and 41-49 is/are pending	in the application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	Irawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21,24-28 and 41-49</u> is are rejected		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.	
Application Papers	•	
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ ac	7	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	•	
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		roved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in	· -	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority docume		•
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		•
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the paper application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for a I 	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	estic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome		
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s	5) Notice of Information	ry (PTO-413) Paper No(s) I Patent Application (PTO-152)

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 21, 24-28 and 41-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Muffoletto et al. (Muffoletto) (New rejection with regard to claims 41-48).

Reference is made to claims 1 and 7 of the patent to Muffoletto. It is inherent that with the thickness of the active material being 0.001 inch (25 microns) that the particle size would be within the microstructured size range as claimed in claim 27.

Applicant's arguments have all been considered but are not deemed persuasive. Applicant argues that the pyrite material in Muffoletto does not decompose or transform to a material unsuitable for use as an electrode. The examiner respectfully disagrees. First of all it is noted that Muffoletto uses the same material as applicant-iron disulfide. Because Muffoletto uses the same material as applicant, the iron disulfide would function the same way as applicant and hence the claimed subject matter of applicant is met by the teachings in Muffoletto. Further, because Muffoletto uses the same material as applicant, it could be expected that the pyrite in Muffoletto would function as applicant's in that the material, by itself, would decompose or transform into a material that would be unsuitable for use as an electrode.

Applicant further argues at the top of page 7 of the recent amendment that conventional plasma spray of pyrite does not result in the formation of pyrite. This may be true, however, Muffoletto uses a different plasma spray than is referenced on page 8,

line 8 of the present specification and so a different product is obtained than that shown in the present specification.

The fact that Muffoletto does not set forth a method to prevent pyrite from decomposing during thermal spraying is also argued by applicant. However, as Example 1 of Muffoletto discloses, the battery produced using pyrite as an electrode works and produces power as evidenced by the results shown in Table 2.

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 21, 28, 41, 44, 45 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muffoletto in view of Gay. (New Rejection with regard to claims 41, 44, 45 and 49).

Muffoletto does not specifically teach a nanostructured iron sulfide. Gay discloses a nanostructured iron sulfide in Example 1 of this patent. To utilize in the

teachings of Muffoletto the 15 nanometer particle size of Gay would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made so that the active material would have been packed more tightly and would have produced a greater power output.

Applicant's arguments have again all been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant has argued the above 103 rejection based on the insufficiency of the primary reference to Muffoletto. These arguments are believed to have been adequately addressed in the section 2 of this action.

Finally, applicant asserts that the combination of Muffoletto and Gay do not teach the claimed invention. The examiner believes that they do as evidenced by both sections 2 and 4 of this action. In addition, applicant has not specifically pointed out where the two references as a combination fail to provide all of the claimed elements.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the Art Unit: 1745

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John S. Maples whose telephone number is 703-308-1795. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 6:15-3:45.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gabrielle Brouillette can be reached on 703-308-0756. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

John S. Maples Primary Examiner Art Unit 1745

JSM/2-21-2002